

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XXXVII

SEPTEMBER 8, 1939

No. 881

A Creed and a Culture

George Bull, S.J.

III

The Prime Obligation of a Catholic College

Thomas J. Higgins, S.J.

III

Intellectual and Spiritual Stimulation of Students

D. A. Keane, S.J.

\$1.00 a year **Issued Semi-Monthly**
53 Park Place **The America Press**

5c a copy
New York

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

THE EDITORS OF AMERICA

Very Cordially Invite

THE READER OF THIS PAMPHLET

to enroll as one of the thousands of enthusiastic subscribers to our weekly which is

- the most fearless
- the most respected
- the most quoted

publication in the field of American Catholic Journals. Articles from the pens of noted Americans and Europeans appear in its columns, giving authoritative information on current world events.

No intelligent Catholic can afford to be without this sound exponent of Catholicism and Americanism.

\$4.00 U. S. A.—\$4.50 Canada—\$5.00 Foreign

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY, JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 WEST 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: STEPHEN J. MEANY

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, September 8, 1939. Volume XXXVII, No. 881. Published semi-monthly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York. Subscription postpaid, United States, 5 cents a copy; yearly, \$1.00; foreign, \$1.25. Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 4, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1913. Trade-mark "Catholic Mind," Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XXXVII SEPTEMBER 8, 1939

No. 881

A Creed and a Culture

GEORGE BULL, S.J.

Reprinted from Columbia.

THE question is sometimes asked if the Catholic college is strictly necessary. Even Catholics, at times, wonder if some arrangement other than the present one might not be made; something which might safeguard our religion, but nevertheless allow us to participate in the great non-sectarian system around us.

Some of the replies to this question are not satisfying. To say, for instance, that the Catholic college exists to save souls or to spread the kingdom of God on earth, is as true as it is pious. But it is too general a reply. It gives what the philosophers call the ultimate end, not the immediate and specifying end. It seems to abolish any specific difference between the educator and the missionary. Above all, it takes it for granted that the exclusive purpose of the Catholic college is the formal teaching of the Catholic religion.

This is not true. There is another function, and in the remarks which follow, I shall try to indicate what that other function is. I shall try to show that the function of the Catholic college is not merely to teach the formulas of the Catholic religion, but to impart in a thousand ways, which defy formularization,

the Catholic attitude toward life as a whole. It is not merely to graduate students who have what I may call the Catholic's ready answer in all the fields of knowledge, but students who are so steeped in the Catholic mood that it colors their every activity, and not their religious activity alone. In a word, the function of the Catholic college is not merely to send forth men and women who can repeat, however intelligently, the Catholic formula, in religion, in philosophy, or science, or the arts; but students who are stamped with certain traits which come into play and govern their approach to life in every sphere; students, therefore, who realize that Catholicism is not merely a creed, but a culture.

Now, that Catholicism is a culture, in the sense of an induced attitude towards life as a whole, a habit of looking at all life, from a viewpoint that is marked with definite traits, is something clear from its history, if from no other source.

In the Middle Ages, when Catholicism was unimpeded by outside forces, it embodied its own views of life in its own distinctive art, its own distinctive literature, its own philosophy, its own architecture. Dante and Fra Angelico, Chartres and Rheims only body forth in the realm of the esthetic, in the spontaneous reactions of the artist, that same fundamental approach to life as a whole, which Aquinas couched in the affirmations of the syllogism. And these creations, whether of beauty or of pure intellect, were merely the daily lives of the men of that day, refracted through the medium of genius.

The Catholicism of that day was unquestionably a culture, an attitude not towards life in its religious aspects alone, but towards life as a whole. This, it is easy to realize.

But what is not easy to realize is that that attitude towards life is to be found in our midst today. It is not easy to remember that twenty million Americans,

for instance, should hold in the twentieth century, substantially the views of life which Dante, or Francis of Assisi held; that, in consequence, many of the spontaneous reactions of Catholics, to the life around them, must be motivated pretty much as those of Anselm might have been, or of Bonaventure, or of Abelard.

I do not mean, of course, that there is no difference at all, but only that there can be no difference regarding the fundamental values of life; no difference in the things which are assumed and acted upon in the daily routine, precisely because of those fundamental values.

Now it would carry me too far afield even to mention, much less to detail, what those things are. But there is one trait of the Catholic culture to which I should like to draw special attention. I mention it, not because you do not know it, but because it is peculiarly related to the function of the Catholic college I am discussing; and because it shows with peculiar force how Catholicism as a *culture* is at grips with the modern world, and not merely as a religion. That trait is totality of view regarding life. The habit of looking at life as a whole, and not as a series of departments.

That this was a mark of Catholicism in the Middle Ages, no one now denies. Writers, even hostile writers, are never done telling us that unity and totality were the marks not only of medieval thought, but of medieval life.

"There was one system of education for princes, lords and clerks; one sacred and learned language, the Latin; one code of morals, one ritual, one hierarchy, the Church; one faith and one common interest against heathendom and Islam, one community on earth and in heaven, one system of feudal habits for the whole West" (DeWulf, *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages*, p. 131).

Now the point I should like to make here is this: if that unity and totality have passed from the civilization in which we now live, it has not passed from Catholic thinking on the fundamentals of existence. Catholics still believe that every sphere of human life is related essentially to every other; and that in the conscious and deliberate activity of man, there is no action that can be evaluated as an absolute entity—isolated, that is, from the central fact of man's relation to the Universe. And because this reference of all human activity to the whole, under which for Catholics life is organized, is nearly always implicit and spontaneous, a habit of totality of view is set up, which sets the Catholic at odds with the whole modern outlook on life.

For modern thought, like modern life, is departmentalized. Our institutions reflect, in this respect, too, our thoughts. The dominant ideal is separation—separation of Church and State, separation of science and philosophy, separation of religion and education, even of religion and morality. And what is true of the world that modern man has made is also true within the microcosm of modern man himself. He tries to live as though his social nature were one thing and his individual nature another; as though his life were set like concrete, in moulds; as though there were compartments for his thoughts, his emotions, his actions, like the divisions in his desk or safe. He seems to think he can separate his theory from his practice, his physics from his metaphysics, and make a cleavage between his life as father of a family, as a business man or a public official and his life simply as a human being.

"Each activity [as Mr. Lippmann tells us] has its own ideal, indeed a succession of ideals—for there is no ideal which unites them all and sets them in order. Each ideal is supreme within a sphere of its own. There is no point of reference outside which can de-

termine the relative value of competing ideals. The modern man desires health, he desires money, he desires power, beauty, love, truth, but which he shall desire most, since he cannot pursue them all to their logical conclusion, he no longer has any means of deciding. His impulses are no longer part of one attitude towards life; his ideals are no longer in a hierarchy under one lordly ideal. They have been differentiated, they are free and they are incommensurable" (*A Preface to Morals*).

Here, then, is a clear instance of the antagonism between the Catholic attitude towards life and that of the non-Catholic world. And it is an instance precisely of an *attitude*; of things taken for granted, rather than explicitly declared. Were there time, we could trace a similar antithesis between all the traits of the two cultures. We could, for instance, draw attention to the fact that Catholicism is "other-worldly"—that is, that its emphasis is on the next life, rather than on this; that it stresses the individual rather than Society; that it accents the supernatural rather than the merely natural. And we could show that here again it faces every activity of life, inevitably at odds with a world which puts the emphasis here, rather than hereafter, on Society rather than on the Individual, and on Nature rather than on Grace.

Now we must remember that it is into this world that the Catholic college graduate steps, when he has finished his formal education. He will find implicit in the lives of the men and women about him, the whole point of view which I have just rather cursorily described. And the thing to be emphasized here is that this outlook is implicit rather than explicit, in the lives of the men and women with whom our graduate shall have to live. Many of them are unconscious that they do act under the dominance of such an attitude. Yet it has colored their institutions, their laws, their social customs and their daily routine.

And precisely because it is a thing taken for granted, rather than a matter of explicit declaration, the Catholic graduate who is equipped only with what I have called the Catholic's ready answer, will be at a disadvantage in that world from many points of view. The formulas he has learned, and especially the mentality he has developed, fit him especially to detect a conflict which is explicit rather than implied. If a proposition be advanced in denial of some proposition he has learned, he can reproduce the rebuttal—which he also has learned! He is likely to have the better of any debate—because debates deal with statements; and because formularized knowledge is always the handier in an argument!

But, unfortunately, he will not be required so much to debate in the modern world, as to live. He must encounter not so much a set of formulas as a living, breathing attitude towards life as a whole. And so, despite the intelligence and readiness of his formulas, if he has allowed himself to believe that between him and the modern world there is conflict only in religion, and not in total outlook, he may easily come to subscribe to movements, against which he can find nothing in his formulas, but which contradict, nevertheless, the Catholic's attitude toward life as a whole.

He will hear it said, for instance, at some good-fellowship gathering, "that Catholics and non-Catholics have much in common; so much, indeed, that they can ignore their differences"—a sentiment which is mere sentimentality to one whose whole attitude is marked by totality, and not by departmentalization of view. Again, in some social work, in common with his non-Catholic friends, he may quiver at the sight of the misery of the poor and the sufferings of the children they bring into the world. And he may insensibly come to accept their view, that it were better for such children not to be born at all, than to be born to such a life. And he will not realize that such a position is

incompatible with that trait of the Catholic culture which stresses the next world rather than this.

Now, what is true in these casual instances is more strikingly true in this very question of education. The education which modern man has made, exists inevitably to impart his culture. It is, to begin with, organized on the assumption that it must be neutral in matters of religion. That is, it assumes once again the correctness of the ideal that life can be departmentalized; that religion can be relegated to one of its departments, that it can be side-tracked to a branch in the curriculum like, let us say, physics. If it mentions the virtues at all, it is to speak of honor, or courtesy, or business integrity, or thrift, or patriotism. It does not mention Faith, or Hope, or Charity. Now, you may contend that this system does not deny them. My retort is that it is not a question of explicit denial. You cannot mention the natural virtues, day in and day out, while at the same time you say nothing of those which are supernatural, without forming in the student a view of life which stresses the life of the natural man, rather than the life of grace. You cannot make vivid one set of ideals, and leave untouched another, without throwing the bias of the student's whole attitude toward life in the direction of the ideals you mention, and against those which you do not. And by so much, you are forming in the student a culture; and in the instance given, a culture which is inevitably anti-Catholic.

Yet, it is quite possible, that the Catholic graduate can know the formulas of the Catholic's ready answer, and miss all this very completely. In this matter of education, for instance, he may know the argument for Catholic education, but he does not realize that argument. He does not see that the Catholic position on education is the only one consistent with the Catholic attitude on life as a whole. Under the aegis of his formula, he tends to make the whole issue turn

on this question alone: "Can a Catholic formed in a non-Catholic school safeguard his religion?" He has never asked himself the further question, "Can such a man safeguard his culture?" "Will he emerge from such an atmosphere, not merely holding intellectually the dogmas of his creed, but with a habit of life, which spontaneously stresses the next world rather than this one, the sacredness of the Individual rather than of Society, the Supernatural rather than the merely Natural?" And if he does not ask these questions, he may know, but he does not *realize* his Catholicism. He may have her formulas, but he has not her attitude. Gradually, his formulas will begin to seem very remote from the concrete circumstances of daily life. He does not defend them, because he does not know they are attacked. And he comes finally to the awkward and intolerable position of the man who is Catholic in creed and anti-Catholic in culture.

Now if the institutions of the modern world, and especially its education, be the embodiment and the propagation of its own culture, it is imperative that Catholic education be visualized as propagating the Catholic culture.

There was a time when that was not as imperative as it is today. There was a time, as I already have pointed out, when Catholicism dominated all the living of the Western World. It did not depend (to the same extent as it does today) on its institutions of learning, to spread its own peculiar culture. For it had organized the whole of life. Society was Catholic and the implications of the Catholic viewpoint were taken for granted in the daily routine. The conflict with the anti-Catholic viewpoint was then a matter of explicit denial and affirmation. When the great heresies beat against the City of God, it was a question of a debate against a background accepted by both sides. With Luther or Calvin, for instance, or Henry VIII, it was a question of this or that dogma

of faith, and not whether the emphasis of human life should be placed here, rather than hereafter; on the supernatural rather than the merely natural. To form students *then* in the ready answer was an immediate and pressing objective. For the Catholic culture, *then*, was something the student could not escape. It was the only culture instinct in life around him.

Today all this is changed. The Catholic college must fit its graduate not only to give a reason for the Faith within him, but to catch the whole implications of the life around him. And if the Catholic college has brought him to realize that, his whole attitude towards the modern world will be more secure. He will see that world in that only unity which (as Saint Augustine tells us) it has—namely, its oneness in opposing the whole Catholic point of view! He will see in its institutions a challenge, not to this or that article of his Faith, but an implicit challenge to everything he takes for granted, no matter what activity he may be engaged in—whether it be discussing religion, selling stock, interpreting an Oscar Wilde, or a Noel Coward, going to church, or attending the opera. Any formula he may have learned is pregnant now with a new power. He can use it as it was intended to be used, merely as the ready answer. He is made independent of it in the sense that he knows what it implies, and not merely what it says. It is no longer an isolated proposition; something external to the habits of his life and thought. He comes to look first to the substance, which is Catholicism, and only afterwards to the terms in which minds however great have sought to give it expression. He is no longer harried by a merely defensive psychology. He is alert, he is serene, he is enthusiastic, as only he can be who not only knows abstractly his Catholicism, but realizes its divine totality even in the spontaneous activity of daily life.

This, then, is the function of the Catholic college, to which I should like to draw your attention. It is not its only function. It is merely one which is sometimes overlooked. To say that the Catholic college exists merely to teach the formal Catholic religion, is, to my mind, to express only part of its purpose. Catholicism is a culture, not merely a creed; an attitude, a whole complexus of things taken for granted, in every activity of life and not in the sphere of the strictly religious alone. And it is the business of Catholic education to impart that culture, just as it is the business of all other systems to communicate the culture which is theirs.

I realize that much that I have said has been insufficiently said. I have said nothing, for instance, on the great question of how a college which imparts a culture, and not merely a creed, will make thinkers who are productive in that culture, and not merely reproductive.

I have passed over, also, the whole question of the practical means the Catholic college should take to fulfil this function. I have not tried to show how this emanation of the whole Catholic's attitude can be made to color the teaching in every sphere: in law, in pharmacy, in medicine and in the sciences, not less than in religion, in philosophy and in the arts. But that question is too large for this time and place. I can only say, with Mr. Chesterton, that there is a Catholic way of teaching everything, even the alphabet, if only to teach it in such a way as at the same time to teach that those who learn it must not look down on those who don't!

In conclusion, I should like to add only this. If the Catholic college in this country has neglected even partially either of its two functions, it has not neglected the first. It has, thank God, sent forth from its halls generations of men and women who know

their Catholic Faith, in the sense that they can give the ready answer.

But if there be Catholic college graduates who cling to their creed, and yet try to ape an alien culture; if there be, in consequence, the Catholic graduate who is bewildered in the grip of modern life; if there be the dismayed Catholic, the apologetic Catholic—can we say it is due, in any sense, to neglect of the second function? Has the Catholic college in this country been more intent on teaching the ready answer than upon imparting the culture? Has it been content with reproductive Catholic thinking rather than with stimulating productive Catholic thought?

There are two sides to this question. And I should not like to have to decide between them now.

The Prime Obligation of a Catholic College

THOMAS J. HIGGINS, S.J.

WHEN a college swings wide its doors at the beginning of a new scholastic year, college officials are immersed to their very eyes in the business of exacting from students every manner of obligation. Treasurers are swamped taking in fees. Deans are laying down the law to delinquent students. Freshmen are being put through psychological and placement tests. Teachers are indicating to classes the sort of things they are not going to tolerate in their lecture rooms. All this makes a very familiar picture. Let us look at the reverse side and examine the obligations of the college. To whom does the college owe its greatest debt? To its benefactors? To the State? To the public at large? No, a college was founded primarily for the benefit of the youth who come to it.

In their regard, justice and charity lay a very heavy and complicated demand upon the college. This I shall endeavor to explain from the viewpoint of a Catholic college administrator.

The birth into this world of a child is an event fraught with unpredictable, even eternal consequences, because nature and nature's God have imposed upon the parents of that child an inescapable duty of preparing it not only for adult but especially for immortal life. Left to themselves, parents are inadequate to this task. They must seek help from other agencies, first of which is the school. Because of their station in life or because they discern special potentialities in their children, certain parents ambition a fuller, more complete preparation for their young. This they ask the college to provide.

When a college admits a young man, it assumes a most momentous responsibility to the boy himself, to the boy's parents and to society at large. To society at large, because the community normally expects that its future leaders will come from the ranks of the college educated. Naturally, it has a vital interest in the number and quality of such leaders. To the parents, because at this stage of a boy's development, a college voluntarily takes over the major portion of a responsibility for which these parents must render an account before the judgment seat of God. The college enters into an implied contract with these parents pledging itself to produce in their sons certain real and tangible results. What are these desired results? What is that pre-eminent good with which the college endeavors to endow its student body? In explaining this, I shall be explaining the prime obligation of a college.

This may be summed up in these familiar words: a Christian liberal education, by which we understand the adequate and harmonious training and perfecting of all the faculties of the youth so that when

he comes of adult age, he may discharge his duties efficiently, develop his nature to the full and by so doing, attain to his eternal destiny. This process of training cannot be a special discipline for a specialized avocation. A liberal education cannot aim at the production of so many dentists, high-powered salesmen, accountants or expert technicians. It looks rather to make a boy a better man. It envisions not a narrow-minded, lopsided man who can make a living but does not know how to live; its purpose is not to sharpen merely the money-making faculties of youth, nor does it undertake to train boys' bodies. That it leaves to parents. It concerns itself with the boy's soul, with his spiritual faculties; it proposes to produce a very definite result in the youth's intellect and will.

Our will is our most precious endowment, our noblest faculty. It is this power of free choice which makes us men, marks us off from brute creation. By the proper use or misuse of it, we win or lose our eternal destiny. Hence any educational system which makes no provision for will training is not liberal, is not human, is of no value to men. A truly Christian and liberal education looks to the production of virtuous habits, the sum of which we call character. Character has been defined as life dominated by principles. I say dominated in the sense that a man of character is not led to make his decisions because of changing whim, shifting expediency, passing advantage or feeling, but because by repeated act, he has taught himself to act according to fixed and proven norms of conduct to which he consistently adheres despite weakness, temptation or occasional lapses. Principles of what sort? Immutable principles founded on human nature, established, defined and promulgated by the Author of human nature Himself.

In the Gospel of Saint Mark, we read: "A certain man running up and kneeling before Him asked, 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may receive life ever-

lasting?" and Jesus said to him, "Thou knowest the Commandments—do not commit adultery; do not kill, do not steal; bear not false witness; do no fraud; honor thy father and thy mother.'" It is simply because men do not follow these rules that the world is topsy-turvy today. Hence in the time of his development, youth must be taught that only conduct patterned after such principles is reasonable and worthy of a man. He is to be induced to act as befits one whose word is his bond. He may have before him the appalling example of wholesale perjury in courts of law, of high placed officials who have sworn a solemn oath to defend the Constitution of the United States and yet secretly connive with or tolerantly wink at an insidious faction boring from within and without to destroy that same Constitution. He may see around him abundant evidence that lying, double-dealing, sharp practise pay dividends; that distortion and suppression of facts, large scale propaganda achieve sizeable results. He may read in public print brazenly naive confessions and defenses of unchastity from the pens of college students themselves. He may know that on some college campuses, chastity is treated with raucous derision, condemned as a sure road to insanity. He may daily see whole classes of people crying to the government: "Gimme, gimme"—people who are always looking for something for nothing, who depend not upon their own self-reliant efforts but upon a paternalistic government that has promised to support them. He may behold nothing in the public life of the nation to remind him that the chief law of all human life is this: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with thy whole mind and with thy whole heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength."

Nevertheless, unless he shall emerge from college a self-reliant man, the master not the slave of his passions, one who consistently honors his bond and worships his God, his college has failed him. It is not

enough that college presidents sonorously enunciate moral platitudes on Commencement Day. The machinery of the college must actually be geared to produce men with Christian character. This end must daily be in the minds of college administrators. Techniques of administration must be set up capable of producing virtuous men. This is possible only if the college makes adequate provision for religious instruction and practise, not in the sense that the greater part of the students' time is to be occupied with formal courses in religion, but that the entire atmosphere of the college flows naturally from religious conviction; that its procedures and methods are guided by religious principles. Men were made for God and God alone. No college can successfully ignore men's relations to God. God will not be cheated. To attempt to educate with no reference to God is as silly as to try to train sailors and never let them see the ocean or to prepare a football team that never sees a football or to preserve animal life without food and air.

An educated man not only has character, he possesses an intellect trained to remember, to weigh evidence, to distinguish fact from fancy, to elicit judgments free from bias and prejudice. His is a mind capable of expressing itself in spoken or written words, that is able to grasp a given problem in life, evaluate it for its true worth and render to it a fitting answer. Such a mind must be implemented by the possession of basic truth. Those fundamental realities which underlie all knowledge and enter every department of human activity must be his sure possession. He must know who God is and what is man; his duties to God, to himself and his fellowmen. False notions here are a criminal handicap, a worse obstacle to a man than the loss of eyes and limbs.

Because of the peculiar troubles of our day, he cannot be a leader who has not a correct understand-

ing of the nature and functions of the State. He must be cognizant not only of his duties to the State, but understand aright the State's obligations to its citizens. For the State is not a super entity for whose glory and enhancement all private interests must be sacrificed, nor is it the sacred depository of all rights, whence is doled out to the people some crumbs and fragments of rights. The State was made for the citizen, not the citizen for the State. The purpose of the State is to insure peace and provide for the public prosperity of its citizens. What the individual or the family cannot do for itself in a material way is to be accomplished by the collective efforts of all citizens co-operating under the authority of sovereignty. What the citizen can do for himself, the State may not do for him. It is always pertinent to remember that governmental officials are public servants, not masters of the public and are responsible to the citizenry for an account of their trust. In this connection, the experience of the past is an apt and eloquent teacher. From the accumulated wisdom of ages past, we can judge the present and read the future. For the weaknesses, vanities and appetites of men are ever the same; the only thing that changes is the opportunity to exploit them. The horse and buggy age and every other age will pass away but the word of Solomon remains true: "There is nothing new under the sun."

The surpassing glory of ancient Rome was won by its substantial middle class, citizens who formed the backbone of its armies. It is well to remember how these same citizens conceived the notion that the government in the person of Caesar should support them; they clamored for bread and games. They got their bread and games, but within nine generations, the barbarians got them, took away their place and snuffed out their glory. After a thousand years of rule, the French monarchy came to grief in a blood bath, because from the year 1770 to 1787 it couldn't balance

its bu
past
by d
make
the p
stake
T
ship
Ame
thre
1
ent
2
citiz
3
sion
tha
of M
wea
the
the
jud
nev
eith
me
lov
the
the
er
of
of
me
in
th
W

its budget; it yearly piled up a deficit. Nor does the past tell us that economic prosperity was ever secured by destroying the bounty of nature. Wilful waste makes woeful want always. Without a knowledge of the past we can neither understand the present nor stake out the future.

Today it is essential that a boy destined for leadership have a thorough grasp of the principles of our American Democracy which may be summed up under three heads:

1. The form that government is to take is dependent on the will of the governed.
2. There are certain inalienable rights in every citizen that no government can abrogate.
3. There must be a balanced, self-checking division of the functions of authority.

This last principle has been nowhere better expressed than by John Adams who wrote into the Constitution of Massachusetts: "In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative or judicial powers or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative or executive powers or either of them; to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men."

Whether we are lifted up in prosperity or sunk low in depression, no matter how much we increase the products of technology and thereby complicate the function of life, our American way demands a government of laws and not of men. For a government of laws is our sole guaranty against that most odious of abuses—governmental tyranny. A government of men no matter how benevolent or well intentioned leads inevitably to loss of political freedom and from this, the step is very short to the loss of religious liberty. Witness Europe, 1938!

In brief then, the prime obligation of a Catholic

college lies not in the production of a Rose Bowl football team, but in men of Christian piety. Its chief concern is not in soft-soaping rich alumni, kow-towing to standardizing agencies or even in securing library grants from PWA, but in transmitting undefiled to its student body a sane and ordered way of life; in building its boys into men of character, intelligent leaders, prepared to uphold our Christian civilization and American Democracy, worthy one day to look upon the face of our Blessed God.

Intellectual and Spiritual Stimulation of Students

D. A. KEANE, S.J.

Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939. Reprinted from the Jesuit Educational Quarterly.

TODAY the problem of motivating our students to accept what we are dedicated to give them seems to be as great or even greater than the problem of improving or altering our curriculum. The fact that education in the United States has been drifting away from the classical curriculum, and attention and emphasis centered on vocational courses, practical sciences, and studies which are predominantly informational, places us in the position of those who *cantant extra chorum*.

What, then, can we do to overcome the prejudices our students may have toward our standard curriculum? How can we arouse in them an interest in study, a desire to learn, and, instead of laboring to force into them what they do not want, how can we convert them into wanting what we are best prepared to give?

In regard to intellectual stimulation:

1. Appeal strongly to the senses and the imagination as a means of appealing strongly to the mind.

Youth today lives in a world whose keynote is sense impression. Hence, the need in teaching to use analogy, illustration, devices by which eye, ear, and sense imagination are enlisted; to use the blackboard for diagramming, picturizing, visualizing.

2. Arouse in the students a desire to do things themselves. There is danger in doing too much for the student. Some teachers do most of the student's thinking, dictate the answers, solve his problems. They cannot stimulate him in this way.

3. The stimulus of success is potent as an influence not only for the immediate but also for the remoter future. Hence, the teacher's need to cultivate the art of helping individuals to succeed in school work.

4. Make use of the extrinsic stimulus of reward. The spirit of competition has always appealed to youth. Contests within the classroom, between classes, with a prize to the winner, awaken interest and dispel apathy.

5. Frequent testing, together with prompt correction and public listing of grades, has proved to be a very valuable asset in stimulating students to gain a mastery of their subject matter and implicitly has been a stimulant to the intellectual processes of the student.

6. There is need to provide the relatively small group of superior students in any class with incentives to develop themselves in proportion to their talents. These incentives can be given through literary academies, modeled on those described in the *Ratio Studiorum*.

7. Perhaps the most important factor in intellectual stimulation is the teacher himself. The imaginative teacher who teaches with enthusiasm, who keeps his class active, who correlates new ideas with known facts, who remembers while he is teaching Latin or English or mathematics or religion that he

is not dealing with pure intellects but for the most part with creatures of sense, with imaginations and emotions, will clothe his subject matter with color and warmth, with originality and freshness of approach, and strive to make his textbook characters laugh and cry, strain and groan, exult and rejoice.

As regards spiritual stimulation:

1. The present-day environment in which our students live, dominated by the sensationalism of the newspaper and the cheap and often vulgar appeal of the radio programs, tends to have a neutralizing effect on our religious training of students.

2. Consequently, one immediate objective of spiritual stimulation is to find ways of putting God and spiritual things in the forefront of the minds of our students and of keeping them there. But thoughts of God and spiritual things will not stay in the mind merely because they are spoken of. Such spiritual activities, then, should be promoted in the school as will help to bring the remembrance, the love and esteem of God and of spiritual things into the daily lives of students.

3. The Sodality of Our Lady, with its meetings, special devotions, and organized group discussions, will aid greatly in providing spiritual activity and spiritual interest.

4. Administrators and teachers must also work toward creating a fine spiritual atmosphere in the school. This will be accomplished in many ways: by providing in the library an attractive and well-chosen section on Catholic literature, lives of the saints, etc., and by acquainting the boys with this special section; by the use of bulletin boards to interest students in Catholic action, Catholic activities, good books, devotions, etc.; by providing a priest counselor for the students; by tactful classroom reminders of spiritual things, such as frequent Holy Communion, special devotions, the Sodality.

FOR PAMPHLET REFERENCE FILES

Special Sets \$1.00

ENCYCLICALS

- | | |
|--|--|
| * Atheistic Communism | * The Holy Ghost |
| The Catholic Priesthood | The Holy Rosary |
| † Christian Constitution of States | † The Holy Year |
| Christian Democracy | Prayer and Expiation |
| † Christian Education of Youth | * The Reconstruction of the Social Order |
| * Christian Marriage | The Reparation Due to the Sacred Heart |
| * The Condition of the Working Classes | What Is Marriage? (Analysis of <i>Casti Connubii</i>) (25c single copy) |
| * Spain | |
| * Germany and the Church | |

5 Cents Each

Complete Set, \$1.00—Includes Postage

Single Copy, by Mail, Ten Cents—100 for \$4.00; 1,000—\$30.00
Postage Extra

COMMUNISM

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| * An Approach to Social Justice | Communist Action vs. Catholic Action |
| * Atheistic Communism | * Encyclical on Spain |
| The Church in Spain, Rich or Poor? | Fascism in Government and in Society |
| Communism and American Youth | † General Franco Rescues New Spain |
| * Communism and the Catholic Answer | * Joint Letter of the Spanish Bishops |
| Communism and the Masses | No Democratic Government in Spain |
| * Communism in Mexico | Religion and the Social Revolution |
| Communism in Spain | Spain in Chains |
| Communism's Threat to Democracy | |
| * Communism in U. S. A. | |

5 Cents Each

Complete Set, \$1.00—Includes Postage

Single Copy, by Mail, Ten Cents—100 for \$4.00; 1,000—\$30.00
Postage Extra

*—Has Study-Club Supplement.

†—White-Cover Reprint from *The Catholic Mind*.

THE AMERICA PRESS : 53 Park Place : New York, N. Y.

INTERRACIAL JUSTICE

JOHN LaFARGE, S.J.

"One of the most important contributions to Sociology as well as the last word on the Negro and his place in the Church."

THE CATHOLIC WORKER

"The last excuse for ignorance of the Negro Question has been annihilated."

CARD. HAYES LITERATURE COMM.

CONTENTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| I. THE STUDY OF RACE RELATIONS | X. SEGREGATION |
| II. WHAT IS RACE? | XI. RACE PREJUDICE |
| III. RACIAL DIFFERENCES | XII. SOCIAL EQUALITY AND INTERMARRIAGE |
| IV. STATUS OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO | XIII. EDUCATION |
| V. HUMAN RIGHTS | XIV. EFFORTS AT ADJUSTMENT |
| VI. SPECIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS | XV. A CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL PROGRAM |
| VII. GUARANTEES OF HUMAN RIGHTS | XVI. INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND THE CHURCH'S WORK FOR THE NEGRO |
| VIII. CHRISTIAN TEACHING ON HUMAN UNITY | |
| IX. SECURITY | |

\$2.00 per copy

THE AMERICA PRESS

53 Park Place

New York, N. Y.